DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 890 TM 870 467

AUTHOR Novak, John M.
TITLE The Invitational Imagination for Theory, Research, and Practice.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Objectives; *Creative Thinking; Discovery Processes; Educational Attitudes; Educational Innovation; Educational Methods; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Research; *Heuristics; Humanization; *Imagination; Inquiry; Models; *Progressive Education; Quality of Life; *Research Needs; Social Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Invitational Education; Optimism

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that just as imagination has been important for the inception and promotion of invitational education, it is also necessary for the development of inviting research strategies. Applying the educative process to the study of inviting, recommendations are made for relating the constituent parts of the inviting stance (optimism, respect, trust, and intentionality) and factors (people, places, policies, and programs) to construct an imaginative research structure. Next, a heuristic analysis of the inviting process is presented in a series of imaginative monologues as they might be delivered by the theorists Edward de Bono, Donald Schon, and Abraham Edel. The analysis from de Bono's perspective generates questions based on his "six hat thinking" model, finally emphasizing the role of optimism, emotion, and intuition in invitational education and the need to promote creative and reflective thinking. A critique in the manner of Schon shows vacillation in invitational education between technical rationality and an epistemology of practice, and an ambiguity between a salesmanship stance and true mutuality. Edel's work is used to connect invitational education with several larger social issues: global perspective, equality, democratization, responsible technology, competition, community, and humanism. The final section of the paper suggests a metaphor, model and method for integrating theory, research, and practice. (Author/LPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED285890

The Invitational Imagination for Theory, Research, and Practice

JOHN M. NOVAK

College of Education
Brock University
St. Catharines, Ontario
Canada L2S 3A1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. M Novak

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April, 1987.

TM 870 467

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that just as imagination has been important for the inception and promotion of invitational education, it is also necessary for the development of inviting research strategies. Applying the educative process to the study of inviting, recommendations are made for relating the constituent parts of the inviting stance (optimism, respect, trust, and intentionality) and factors (people, places, policies, and programs) to construct an imaginative research structure. Next, observations of the inviting process are created from the writings of Edward de Bono, Donald Schon, and Abraham Edel. The analysis from de Bono's perspective points out the emphasis on optimism, emotion, and intuition in invitational education and the need to promote creative and reflective thinking. Schon's "investigation" shows vacillation in invitational education between technical rationality and an epistemology of practice along with an ambiguity in the intention of the inviting process. Edel's work is used to connect invitational education with larger social issues. In the final section of this paper, a metaphor, model, and method are suggested for integrating theory, research and practice.

PREFACE

The notion of "inviting school success" began and developed through imaginative acts: Imagine using a metaphor of "doing with" rather than "doing to" as a framework for looking at the teacher-student relationship; imagine focussing on the variety of messages intended, extended, received, and acted upon in educational settings; imagine trying to make schools the "most inviting place in town". With this imaginative inception, texts have been written (Purkey, 1978; Purkey and Novak, 1984; Purkey and Strahan, 1986; Wilson, 1986; Purkey and Schmidt, 1987), an International Alliance has been formed, and a conceptual model has been developed. Thus educators seeking to promote inviting practices have ample supplies available.

Success in promoting inviting practices does not guarantee success in theory development and research. It might even make it more difficult - Why look too closely at a good thing?; or, if it's not broken, why fix it? However, without sustained and systematic inquiry, the concept of "inviting school success" runs the risk of becoming an enthusiastic battle-cry (What do we want? Inviting! When do we want it? Now!) or a gentle reminder (Have you invited your students today?). I think we can and should do more than this. This paper is based on the assumption that if "inviting" is worth promoting, it is worth serious study. This, I believe, is the highest tribute that can be paid to any approach to education.

INTRODUCTION

Imagination involves using "what if" questions to probe possibilities for belief and action. By thinking in terms of the language of possibility, ideas can be extended and actions explored. New ways of thinking and being in the world may develop.

"What if" thinking has been essential for the development and promotion of invitational education. For example, the theory and practice of invitational education could be understood as the answer to the basic question, "What would happen to schools if the process of inviting were used to organize educational practice?"

Following this line of imaginative thinking, this paper will examine what might happen to the practice of invitational education if this "what if" thinking were applied to the development and promotion of conceptual and empirical research in invitational education. It will use a series of "What if" questions to step back from, refocus, connect to larger social issues, and develop new approaches to the theory, research and practices of invitational education. Let's see what develops.

I. What if we applied the educative process to inviting?

The usual process of thinking in invitational education is to apply the inviting process to education. What is emphasized is being inviting in educational situations. The effort and attention then is to look for strategies and tactics to achieve inviting schools, using what Argyris and Schon (1974)

call "single loop" learning. Reversing this proposition emphasizes the educative process of getting smarter about worthwhile things. Rather than taking the inviting approach for granted, it is the process which is directly studied. This brings into consideration "double loop" (Argyris and Schon, 1974) learning, examining and reconstructing values and assumptions as a result of feedback. What develops then is the study of a dynamic process, paying particular attention to the subtleties, intricasies, and consequences of the inviting approach. Let's imagine how this can connect to the basic components of the inviting approach.

II. What if invitational researchers exhibited the "inviting stance"?

The inviting stance, is a dispositional quality, emphasizing optimism, respect, trust, and intentionality which affects the creation and maintenance of actions, programs, policies, and places. Invitational researchers who operated from this stance might possess the following characteristics:

(a) Optimism: They would have a positive vision about the necessity of, and possibilities for, free and open inquiry into the inviting process.

(b) Respect: They would embrace a special "being with" attitude of mutuality with themselves, other researchers, participants of their research, and the processes they were studying.

(c) Trust: They would build on the interdependence of fellow researchers to develop important patterns

of action for understanding, exploring, and critiquing the subtleties and implications of inviting practices.

(d) Intentionality: They would see their research as "a purposive act intended to offer something beneficial for consideration" (Purkey and Schmidt, 1987, p. 9). In other words, they would be deliberate about their deliberations because they felt they were doing something worthwhile.

Putting this stance into action, it could be imagined that these researchers would appreciate the people involved in inviting research by seriously considering their research methods and knowledge and value claims. It could be imagined that in addition, these researchers might establish a place or places where there would be regularly scheduled public discussions about the developing concepts, methods, and implications of inviting research. Also they might develop policies based on public criteria for encouraging, regulating, and evaluating research methods and knowledge and value claims about invitational education. Finally, focussed research programs which emphasized the particular dynamics of the inviting approach could be actively encouraged. Rather than seeing inviting as a universal model which can be generally applied to anything, they would emphasize developing a researchable theory of practice, something which could be validated and modified as a result of self-correcting inquiry.

This is an extension of what has already begun with

the Special Interest group on Invitation Education. Let's imagine what this research group might do if it wanted to more fully explore invitational education.

III. What if we invited outside consultants to examine invitational education?

(a) Mapping the Territory

Image that we decide to call Edward deBono who, as the book jacket to Six Thinking Hats (1985) immodestly claims, "is regarded as the leading international authority in the field of conceptual thinking". Dr. de Bono accepts our invitation because he considers it invisably appropriate and comes to address us at this very instant. There is a knock on the door and Edward deBono enters.

There is a silence at first. Remembering that deBono is British we realize that he probably will not say anything until he is formally introduced. Introductions are quickly given and de Bono addresses the gathering:

> To get to the point, if you want to get an overview of invitational education you need to separate out the different types of perceptions you have available and try to use each in turn. This should enable you to make a more complete map and might even suggest some interesting routes to travel.
>
> Okay we say, what are the different types of perceptions we have available?
>
> Funny you should ask. I just wrote a book

called Six Thinking Hats (1985) in which I spell out rather succinctly and imaginatively, if I can be a bit immodest (we noticed), how effective thinking can be orchestrated. By putting on a different thinking hat when we wish to explore facts, emotions, negative judgments, optimistic possibilities, creative movement, and thinking about our thinking we get a systematic overview of an issue, problem or idea. Would you like to try this with invitational education?

Sounds good to us we say. Let's give it a try and see what we come up with.

DeBono describes each of his six types of thinking and we supply questions and statements. (Actually, the questions and statements are ones that I have been presented with over the years and imagined I recorded.) What follows is a brief summary of the session.

WHITE HAT THINKING

Facts, Figures and Information (Imagine Joe Friday trying to gather evidence saying, "Nothing but the facts, nothing but the facts".)

How many people are involved in invitational education?

What research has been done?

What have been the criticisms of the Inviting School Success?

What does the Alliance for Invitational Education do?

What are the major concepts of invitational education?

How has the theory changed over the years?

What happens to schools which adopt an inviting approach?

What might an inviting school look like?

What kinds of research instruments have been developed?

How does someone get to be an inviting educator?

Why do people come to invitational education conferences?

Why have some people stopped coming to invitational education conferences?

RED HAT THINKING

Feelings, Emotions and Intuitions (Imagine a sensitivity group where people are to let it all hang out with no fear of judgment.)

It all sounds too idealistic.

The world is not that simple.

Are you just talking about people having fun?

This will work as long as you just stick to the superficial and pleasant aspects of education.

It feels good to be around inviting people.

I wish everybody were inviting all the time.

Inviting is okay, if you have that sort of personality.

This is an important message that we all need to be reminded of.

Just another group of true believers trying to get us to be enthusiastic.

A non-controversial way of getting promoted.

Why can't our administrators be that way?

Why can't our teachers be that way?

We've heard it all before!

It's so nice to hear again!

It's too easy!

It's too hard!

I don't understand what you are saying.

Is that all you're saying?

Everybody knows that.

Why are you so emotional?

So what's in it for me?

Sounds like a pleasant little cocktail party.

You've got to be kidding?

Why do these people smile so much?

If this thing is as good as you say, where are all the people?

Isn't inviting just a charming way to set an advantage over someone?

Sounds like American hype to me.

It takes a lot of courage to work in a field like that.

BLACK HAT THINKING

Negative Judgments, Risks and Dangers (Imagine a cautious diamond cutter who's greatest fear is enthusiastic ignorance.)

What can go wrong with this approach?

Isn't there usually a let-down after an enthusiastic beginning?

What does this approach say about big social issues?

Will this approach enable us to raise test scores?

Where's the systematic research to support his approach?

Is this approach anymore than a slogan?

If this stuff is so good why isn't it bigger?

Give me some instances where this approach went wrong?

What are the major drawbacks of this approach?

Aren't we doing this already?

Aren't people being invited all of the time via advertising?

YELLOW HAT THINKING

Opportunity and Optimistic Judgments (Imagine a group of invitational educators.)

How can we make schools more inviting places to be?

What are some inviting things that are happening here already?

What are some examples of inviting signs?

Let's form an alliance of kindred spirits?

How about we have a yearly celebration?

Let's swap lists of inviting things that work for each of us.

How can we make this school more inviting?

These concepts apply to all human interactions.

What have we learned from our mistakes?

Let's give an inviting school award.

Good things happen when we break bread together.

GREEN HAT THINKING

Creativity, Provocation and Movement (Imagine a "think tank" trying to develop a new advertising campaign.)

Let's write inviting children's stories so students can teach the concepts to their teachers.

Let's have international Inviting Day!

Let's declare a year moratorium on using the word "inviting".

What if we have a school course in inviting?

Let's write a play about people being diabolically disinviting.

Let's make it illegal for people to invite others for a week.

Let's wire teachers for a week and see if they are inviting.

Let's wire invitational educators for a week and see if they are inviting.

Let's bring in non-educators to tell us how they use inviting techniques.

What if we said people couldn't come to an invitational conference unless they have done three inviting things?

What would an inviting society look like?

Is there a biology of inviting?

BLUE HAT THINKING

Orchestrating and Controlling Thinking (Imagine a film director or baseball general manager reflecting on what to do.)

What kind of thinking is needed in invitational education?

How much criticism is necessary?

How can the metaphor of inviting be applied to education when schooling is compulsory?

What does the previous analysis show?

De Bono concludes his visit with the following comment:

> There is much for you to think about from the questions and statements that have been generated. It seems to me that invitational education is primarily based on yellow hat (optimism and opportunity) thinking which can generate red hat (feelings and emotions) responses, both positive and negative. Interesting morality plays can develop from the tension, but growth is going to require green hat (creativity and movement) thinking to resolve some black hat (negative judgments) thinking. I suggest you do some blue hat (thinking about your thinking) thinking if you wish to open up new research possibilities.

We thank Edward de Bono and look for someone who can help us think about our thinking.

(b) Refocussing

Imagine that after participating in de Bono's shotgun approach to the study of invitational education we decide to look more closely at the inviting process. In line with our policy to bring in some of the most respected minds in the field, we ask Donald Schon, Ford Professor of Urban Studies

and Education at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Professor Schon readily accepts our invitation because he feels it fits in so well with the thoughts he has been developing over the years in Theory and Practice (Argyris and Schon, 1974), The Reflective Practitioner (Schon, 1983), and his latest book, Educating the Reflective Practitioner (Schon, 1987). Enter Donald Schon. Schon comes into the room, is introduced and reads the following report:

> Please excuse the reading of this report but time is very limited and I wish to get to the heart of the issue. As I read the literature on invitational education in general, and the inviting process in particular, I find it simultaneously ambiguous and hopeful. Let me address the ambiguous side first.
>
> As you know, my work deals with the development of professional artistry. I have pointed out the limitations and irrelevance of an over-reliance on a technical rationality that "holds that practitioners are instrumental problem solvers who select technical means best suited to particular purposes" (p. 3). I have argued that this does not work nor is it what successful practitioners really do in complicated situations. In its place I have developed an epistemology of practice which focuses on knowing-in-action, reflection-in-action, and reflection on reflection-in-action. These are not meant to be

concepts derived from remote theory but types of thinking artistic practitioners use as they successfully deal with the uncertainty, uniqueness, and value conflicts in their professions.

Invitational education seem to vacillate between using a technical rationality (here are the steps you follow to guarantee success) and an epistemology of practice (successful inviters "listen to the ice"). The invitational model, although it might be useful for presentation and promotional purposes, is an example of aiming for technical rationality. With its neat boxes and arrows it intimates that there is an instrumental calculus for solving invitational problems. On the other hand, attention to reading situations and making adjustments accordingly seem to focus on the dynamics of the process. Since artistry comes from a sensitivity to the situation and the techniques used, this is the approach that I favour. Does invitational education want it both ways? Does it really think there can or should be an exact science of inviting school success? The ambiguity however, may not only be in the type of knowledge sought but the actual intention of the inviting process.

There seems to be at least three ways in which success in inviting has been conceptualized. First, it has been implicitly conceptualized as a monologue

performance done for somebody. Statements such as "holding the point", "making it look easy is the hard part", and "practice, practice, practice" conjure up the image of a polished performer who has his or her act down pat. What is lacking in the conceptualization is the "doing with other people". A second conceptualization of the inviting process involves a "doing with" element, but here it seems analogous to selling. People in sales use skills to find out what you want, get you interested in what they have to sell, and successfully close the deal. The point of sales is to get the customer to buy something the salesperson has to sell. Both are involved in the process, but there is a pre-determined end and the lack of mutuality. It seems to me very possible for a person in sales to go through the inviting skills and find some very helpful suggestions.

A third conceptualization of the inviting process emphasizes a mutuality in the doing-with relationship. Mutuality here means "an exchange not only of respect but also of personal and cultural 'gifts' in such a manner that both giver and receiver are enhanced in their dignity and enriched in their existence" (Freeman, 1987, p. 2). This seems akin to Martin Buber's "I-Thou" relationship and can be found in the concept of "withness" in invitational education, often expressed in such statements as "that class and I were

really with each other today".

Now it might be that invitational educators need to be great performers, skilled salespeople, and mutuality partakers. The practice of each of these, however, requires different ways of framing situations and responses. If the analogy of dance is used, watching a great performer is different than dancing with someone who uses the dancing to sell you something, which is different from dancing with someone who wants to share himself or herself and the music with you. The skills and intentions of each dancer are different.

I am hopeful that invitational educators can sort out these conceptual difficulties. Then they can go on to the more interesting problems of identifying artful practitioners and discovering the specific knowledge and reflective processes they use. I see this as a worthwhile and challenging task.

(c) Connecting With Larger Issues

Imagine that after getting an outside overview of invitational education and refocussing our thinking we decide to seek some philosophical guidance as to how to connect invitational education to larger social issues. We contact Abraham Edel, Research Professor of Philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania. Edel is a well respected philosopher and author of several books, including his recently published Interpreting Education (1985). Not

surprising, Edel agrees to speak to our group. He enters the room and goes to the podium to make the following comments:

Thank you for allowing me to address your group. Since time is of the essence, I'll be brief. I appreciate your continued efforts to refine, revise and reformulate your approach to education. That's what differentiates an educative approach from a dogmatic approach. Ultimately, if invitational education is truly a constructivist approach to education, it will connect with important social problems. This seems to me to be necessary, possible, and desirable because invitational education, with its emphasis on a cluster of ideas like "beneficial", "potential", "optimism", "vision", "civility" and "humanely effective", has an implicit moral agenda - the betterment of our associated living. For this moral agenda, the movement to a more inviting society, to be realized it will have to involve a mature idealism and a sober realism; it will have to be connected to the resolution of the deepest, most urgent problems we collectively face. If we are on the Titanic there is much more we should be doing than individually enjoying the trip.

I would like to present eight themes for consideration for the moral agenda of invitational education. It seems to me that consideration of these themes can provide some guidance in developing

inviting curriculum and policies, two neglected areas in Inviting School Success (Purkey and Novak, 1984). Here are the themes I suggested in Interpreting Education (1985, pp. 135-151):

1. Cultivate a Global Perspective. An inviting society is one in which everybody counts. Since our world is vitally interconnected, "at the very least, the consequences of any social policy or program have to be worked out far enough to see what they would do to others throughout the world" (p. 136). To ignore that those outside of local or national boundaries are of value, worth, and can act responsibly, is to be less than inviting. This seems to me to have serious implications regarding what we teach and how we teach it. For example, a global perspective would be necessary in subjects like geography, history, and science.
2. Expand Equality. Certainly an inviting society is one which does not discriminate on grounds of race, colour, class, sex, ethnic origin, or religion. Struggles for fair treatment in these areas are complex and ongoing. Inviting schools should be developing policies and curriculum to enrich the meaning of equality. This can begin with, but needs to go well beyond, analyzing textbooks for the quantity and quality of treatment

of females and minority groups.

3. Deepen Democratization. The process of inviting focusses on meaningful participation in issues of importance. On a social level this would seem to involve "an open society with an increasingly enlightened citizenry controlling its own destiny" (p. 138). As I see it, "education has not merely the perennial task to create a responsible enlightened citizenry but the task to forge the special reconstructive standard by which to judge its work, a more thorough democratization" (p. 141). Certainly inviting schools would need to be participating in this task of reconstructing the meaning of democracy.

4. Shape a Responsible Technology. In contrasting the inviting family with the efficient factory model of schools, invitational education seems to have a sensitivity to the impact of technological effects on the quality of people's lives. Technological development is not neutral. It effects the possibilities of a more satisfying life. Inviting schools need to emphasize developing "technology with a human face" and assisting people in making responsible choices about the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are required to live in a world fit for a full and flourishing existence.

5. Mute the Competitive Character of Our Culture. As I read invitational education, it seems to be saying, "Since we are all in this together, what can we do to make it more worthwhile?" This emphasis on cooperation and "doing with" is certainly a movement away from the distortions caused by highly competitive social conditions. Invitational educators need to elaborate on the place of competition in schools and society. It might be that "the critique of the place of competitiveness in our culture may thus take shape as an effort to restore excellence as the interpretation of success rather than overcoming the other person" (p. 144). Perhaps then we can really "invite school success".

6. Build a Sense of Community. The necessity of belonging and meeting affiliative needs is strongly stressed in invitational education. A sense of community however, is more than just a psychological need. It is the basis for sharing what is held in common and communication. As I see it, "a sense of community can be cultivated only by rediscovering community of purposes that still exist in a common life, and by throwing sufficient light upon them to guide institutional reconstruction and give it organizational shape, opening the way to the growth of greater or stronger communal

bonds" (p. 147). Schools should be inviting communities which enable people to communicate about important issues which affect the living they share in common.

7. Restore Humanistic Quality. By "humanistic" I mean a quality of life that has a continuity with the past and an emphasis on the production and distribution of goods and services of worth. Since an invitation is a cordial summoning to participate in something worthwhile, an inviting society, like an inviting school, pays serious attention to the quality of life it is implementing. An inviting theory of practice would examine and promote the necessary conditions for goods of worth to be produced and appreciated.
8. Reassess Schooling. This is not the best of all possible worlds and invitational education needs to avoid merely becoming a public relations slogan for the status quo. If invitational education stresses only "being inviting" then it runs the risk of uncritically accepting and sugar-coating the current practices of schooling; it is not then a principled guide to education but a promotional slogan. As I noticed, steps have to be taken to provide criteria for compatibility with the inviting approach (1) Is there a perceptual orientation? 2) Is there an emphasis

on the self? 3) Is the approach humanely effective? 4) Does the approach encourage applicability?) (Purkey and Schmidt, 1987, pp. 106-108). This is a good beginning for considering theories and techniques of counselling, although even here concepts like "humanely effective" and "encourage applicability" need further analyses and refinement. I would hope that when more specific criteria are developed for education they include an emphasis on the self-in-relation and the quality of the educational object of the invitation, along with the previously mentioned seven themes.

In closing, I feel that invitational education has many possibilities and many challenges to face. The road to warranted educational success is not easy. It requires continual and developing re-analysis. I hope invitational educators are willing to take the time and the effort. It surely is needed.

4. What if we took these "what if" questions seriously?

Imagine the serious and systematic study of invitational education by optimistic and positive researchers who met regularly to brainstorm, discuss, and critique the latest developments in invitational education. (We have that possibility now.) What might they do? Let me sketch one possibility.

Imagine a meeting where some invitational researchers

discuss the reports of de Bono, Schon, and Edel. They acknowledge that de Bono helped call to their attention the various dimensions of invitational education, Schon assisted in getting the group to focus on the intricasies of the inviting process, and Edel pointed out the necessity to connect with important and urgent social issues. There is some confusion and frustration about what to do next. After considerable discussion the group came to the following conclusions: 1) that everything about invitational education cannot be studied in minute detail, 2) that the theory will always need re-analysis and refinement, and 3) that these researchers would like to be of assistance to practitioners. An unusual silence pervades the group. There is the feeling that they are back at square one.

Suddenly someone in the group says, "I know how we could be doing focussed, interesting, and useful research. What if (those imaginary words are heard again) we constructed a research program around the study and development of invitational artistry in education?" After much discussion and collaboration the group makes the ideas more coherent and eventually develops a metaphor, model, and method for this research project. What follows is a brief summary of this research program.

METAPHOR

Imagine that we were seriously interested in the study and development of invitational artistry in education.

How would we go about doing this? We could begin with a precise definition of what we were looking for and go from there. The major difficulty however is that we only have a rough approximation of what we are seeking so we have to begin by just pointing in the general direction and then examining what we find. Since it has been shown that there are three possible notions of the inviting process, we might decide which one, or combination thereof, to begin with. It seems that the richest idea of inviting is that which involves a transaction between, with, and for people where something of worth is shared and extended. What is emphasized here is the mutuality which is lacking in the sales' skills and performance metaphors. Perhaps inviting is best described as like good jazz. It may involve a good performance and skills but these are for the purpose of playing together and extending the themes we have developed mutually. The inviting process, like good jazz, centres around sharing, respect, and creativity.

If we can accept this jazz band metaphor, then we have the task of locating examplars of this approach in educational practices. This can be gotten at by providing a general description of the characteristics we seek and then asking people to supply names of people who display these characteristics consistently, especially in very difficult situations.

MODEL

Imagine that we have identified people who are perceived to be artfully inviting. What do we do?

Imagine we have developed our notion of inviting around the jazz band metaphor. We next need to develop a research model. When we use the invitational model provided by Purkey and Schmidt (1987) we find that it provides a wide lens focus (Novak, 1986), but it does not enable us to get to the particular problem of practice and issues people actually face as they try to invite educative events (Novak, 1984). The invitational model, although useful for expository purposes, can lead to a premature "hardening of the categories" when applied to complex situations. The actual experiences may not fit these categories.

Building on Schon's (1987) and Edel's (1985) works, we should be seeking a model based on a phenomenology of experience of educators as they try to invite educative events in difficult situations. In others words, what knowledge and reflective processes do invitational educators manifest as they try to cultivate a more global perspective or expand equality or deepen democratization etc.? Our model, attempting to validate and extend an inviting theory of practice, will focus on the actual knowledge-in-use and reflective processes of those educators working in ambiguous and uncertain situations. It is in situations like this that artistry develops.

METHOD

What if we attempted to separate theory, research and practice in the pursuit of invitational artistry in education?

We would have one group of theoreticians interested in trying to understand and organize the basic concepts and their relationships, another group trying to classify and study the empirical patterns that develop, and a third group putting into practice the recommendations of the other two. This is not the model developed in the previous section nor is it good jazz. Imagine instead we were seeking widespread intelligence and initiative. We might say that every person is simultaneously his or her own theoretician, researcher and practitioner. Rather than separating these functions, they are seen as necessary parts of an organic whole: research is based on practice which is based on theory which is...and the circle expands. What we would have would be a large cadre of invitational educators all seeking to extend and validate the theory through their own research and practice. When they came together they would have a common purpose to communicate about and would have the basis for a thorough and reciprocal professional community. The theory could go beyond the basics, the research into the subtleties, and the practice into the most difficult problems. Just imagine what might happen then.

REFERENCES

Argyris, C. and Schon, D.A. (1974) Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

De Bono, E. (1985) Six thinking hats. Boston: Little, Brown.

Edel, A. (1985) Interpreting education. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction.

Freeman, M. (1987) Mutuality Education. In Ethics in education, 6 (4), 2-4.

Novak, J.M. (1984) Inviting research: Paradigms and projects for a theory of educational practice. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana.

_____. (1986) Toward an integrated theory of inviting: Skills, craft, and art. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

Purkey, W.W. (1978) Inviting school success: A self-concept approach to teaching and learning (1st edition). Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

Purkey, W.W. and Novak, J.M. (1984) Inviting school success: A self-concept approach to teaching and learning (2nd edition). Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

Purkey, W.W. and Schmidt, J. (1987) The inviting relationship: An expanded perspective for professional counseling. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Purkey, W.W. and Strahan, D.B. (1986) Positive discipline: A pocketful of ideas. Columbus, Ohio: National Middle School Association.

Schon, D.A. (1983) The reflection practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.

_____. (1987) Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wilson, J.H. (1986) The invitational classroom. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.